

Page Denied

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied

Central Intelligence Agency



Washington, D.C. 20505

OLL 84-1281

5 April 1984

Mr. William A. Maxwell
Office of Legislative Reference
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

Dear Bill:

As I stated in our recent telephone conversation, I am submitting the enclosed views letter on H.R. 2133 on behalf of the Intelligence Community Staff. Your advice is requested whether there is any objection to the submission of this letter from the standpoint of the President's program.

The Intelligence Community Staff has informed me that the Congressional request for this letter is urgent. I am sure they would appreciate your efforts to speed clearance of their views letter.

Sincerely,



STAT

Office of Legislative Liaison

Enclosure

DISTRIBUTION:

Original - Addressee
✓ 1 - OLL Chrono
1 - LEG File: Legislation General
1 - ☐ Signer
1 - D/OLL
1 - DD/OLL

STAT

☐ (6 April 1984)

STAT


Mr. Alan C. Chase
Professional Staff Member
Committee on Armed Services
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Al:

Here is the information you requested concerning the views
of the Intelligence Community on H.R. 2133.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate
to call.

Sincerely,


Director, Intelligence Community Staff

STAT

Enclosure

Sig General

29 March 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Legislation Liaison Officer
Intelligence Community Staff

STAT

FROM:

Assistant General Counsel

STAT

SUBJECT:

Proposed Legislation to Amend the Small
Business Act (H.R. 2133)

This is in response to your request for our views on whether H.R. 2133 could have an impact on the Intelligence Community if enacted. I have had discussions with an attorney in our office who works on contract and procurement matters, and attorneys from NSA, DIA and Defense. The consensus of legal opinion appears to be that there is a potential adverse impact from this bill. While the specific degree of the impact may vary among Intelligence Community components depending upon their individual statutory authorities, all agree that there would be problems in implementing the bill within the Intelligence Community as contemplated by the drafters. You should be aware, however, that CIA strongly believes that its legal authorities are sufficient to exempt its activities from the effects of this bill.

STAT

I understand you have been asked to respond to Alan C. Chase, who is a staffer for the House Armed Services Committee, and I have attached for your review and consideration comments you may wish to raise with Mr. Chase regarding the potential impact of the bill. However, I would like to caution you that my coordination has been informal, and each interested agency should be given a chance to weigh in formally before presenting these views to Congress as their official positions. In this way any attempt to remedy the problems we have raised can be given careful review to ensure the protection of Community equities. Please do not hesitate to call me if you have any questions or comments.

STAT

cc:

LD/OLL

STAT

Page Denied

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Denied



Office of Legislative Affairs

OLL Chron

84-1280/1

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

Honorable Jack Brooks
Chairman
Committee on Government Operations
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This presents the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 3987, a bill "To improve the preservation and management of federal records and for other purposes." The Department of Justice opposes the enactment of this legislation.

H.R. 3987 would establish an independent entity, the National Archives and Record Administration under the supervision and direction of the Archivist of the United States, a Presidential appointee. The bill would provide the National Archives with greater powers and functions than those presently retained under the General Services Administration, (GSA) the agency currently responsible for its management and administration. H.R. 3987 would also amend various statutes pertaining to the Archives, in order to conform with the proposed establishment of the Archives Administration.

We are concerned about certain proposed amendments to 44 U.S.C. §§2905 and 3106 of the Federal Records Act, which would expand the enforcement authority of the Archivist and would provide for the Archivist independently to initiate suit for the retrieval of documents that have been wrongfully removed from the custody of a federal agency, and a proposed amendment to 44 U.S.C. §3301 of the Records Disposal Act, which would provide for the inspection of agency records by the Archivist to determine whether records are subject to the records retention requirements of the Records Disposal Act. Although we perceive no direct conflict with the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. §552, we oppose both enactment of §203 of the bill, which would amend 44 U.S.C. §§2905 and 3106, and §204 of the bill, which would amend 44 U.S.C. §3301.

We believe that the existing statutes governing records retention and management provide adequate administrative remedies, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. §§2905 and 3106, for violations of the Federal Records Act, and that the unprecedented establishment of the Archivist's right to designate attorneys, under proposed §203, to represent the Archivist in a retrieval action would be unnecessary

- 2 -

and unwarranted. Under existing law, when an agency determines that records have been improperly removed from its custody, the agency head, the Administrator of GSA and the Attorney General must make a determination whether to initiate suit to retrieve the documents. See 44 U.S.C. §§2905 and 3106.

The Department is concerned that the proposed amendments would undermine this discretionary exercise of authority by the Attorney General on whether to initiate a lawsuit to retrieve wrongfully removed documents. Further, the amendments would clearly undercut the agency's own determination on whether a retrieval action for documents wrongfully removed from its custody would be justified in a particular instance. In this regard, the bill's reference to 28 U.S.C. §518 as purported authority for such litigation seems curious, to say the least, inasmuch as that statute speaks to the primacy of the Attorney General's litigation authority.

The Archivist should not be given litigation authority. Centralization of litigation authority in the Attorney General was first established in 1870 when the Department of Justice was created. Congress has identified the legal officers who are to protect the rights of the government under the records management and disposal laws codified at chapters 21, 29, 31 and 33 of Title 44 of the United States Code, i.e., the Attorney General and the Department of Justice. Sutherland v. International Insurance Co., 43 F.2d 969 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 282 U.S. 890 (1930). Such centralization furthers the important policy goals of ensuring that the government speaks with one voice, ensures consideration of the potential impact of litigation upon the government as a whole, and facilitates presidential supervision over Executive Branch policies implicated in litigation. Section 203 seriously impairs these goals.

The Department has serious reservations about §204 of the bill, which would amend 44 U.S.C. §3301, pertaining to the determination of whether a record is subject to the stringent records retention requirements of the Records Disposal Act, 44 U.S.C. §3301, et seq. Essentially, the proposed provision would permit the Archivist to overrule determinations made by an agency head on whether an agency record comes within the purview of the Act. We fear that such a procedure could result in inaccurate determinations on whether documents are subject to the statute. The agency is much more qualified and able to assess the nature of the documents within its custody than the Archivist. We believe that each agency should make its own determinations, based on its expertise and familiarity with

- 3 -

documents within its custody or possession and under general government-wide guidelines governing such decisions, as to whether its documents are subject to the requirements of the Disposal Act. Under existing law, there are adequate statutory provisions and departmental regulations issued thereunder to achieve the purposes of that Act.

It should be noted that section 204 of H.R. 3987 appears to neutralize 44 U.S.C. §2906(2). Specifically, 44 U.S.C. §2906(2) provides that "Records, the use of which is restricted by law or for reasons of national security or the public interest, shall be inspected, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Administration, subject to the approval of the head of the agency concerned or of the President." The proposed amendment to 44 U.S.C. §3301 would be in conflict with 44 U.S.C. §2906 and would appear to eliminate the discretionary authority of the agency head or the President to limit access to certain records and would directly conflict with Executive Order 12065, "National Security Information" and Executive Order 12356 (effective date August 1, 1982), regarding access to classified National Security Information. Finally, recent experience has shown that National Archives employees often do not have current full-field investigations or appropriate security clearances necessary to gain access to the various levels of National Security Information or Sensitive Compartmental Information. To permit unrestricted access to sensitive and/or Classified National Security Information could compromise ongoing investigations, reveal the identities of informants, endanger the lives and safety of Department employees and seriously impede the mission of the Department of Justice and possibly endanger national security.

Section 201 and section 102 of H.R. 3987 would broaden the responsibilities and authority of the Archivist beyond those currently held by the Administrator of the GSA. These proposals would, at the minimum, confuse the question as to whether the Archivist can have access to records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation over the objection or without the approval of the Director. The Department is concerned that such language might give Archivist personnel unrestricted access to classified information, informant files, information relating to pending investigations, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act records, Title III information, Federal grand jury matters, or tax information provided to the FBI pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §6103.

Additionally, section 102 authorizes the general promulgation of regulations by the National Archives and Record Service (NARS). This section provides that each agency must adopt such orders and

- 4 -

directives as necessary to conform its activities to the NARS regulations. These provisions would make agencies completely subject to the authority of NARS and would make the Archivist the sole arbiter of any conflict between NARS and an agency. We find this provision to be particularly troublesome.

The Department of Justice recommends against enactment of this legislation.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised this Department that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

Robert A. McConnell
Assistant Attorney General